

JUN - 8 2017

Neil Reiff Sandler, Reiff, Lamb, Rosenstein & Birkenstock, P.C. 1025 Vermont Avenue, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20005

RE: MUR 7107

Dear Mr. Reiff:

On July 20, 2016, the Federal Election Commission ("Commission") notified your clients, Progress United PAC and Joseph Aiken, as treasurer, of a complaint alleging violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. On May 25, 2017, based upon the information contained in the complaint, and information provided by the respondents, the Commission found that there is no reason to believe that Progress United PAC and Joseph Aiken, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, or Commission regulations with respect to the allegations in this matter. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on May 25, 2017.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66,132 (Dec. 14, 2009). A copy of the Factual and Legal Analysis is enclosed for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact Don Campbell, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Stevenson

Arating General Counsel

BY: Jeff S. Jordan

Assistant General Counsel Complaints Examination and Legal Administration

Enclosure Factual and Legal Analysis

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

1 2

RESPONDENTS:

RESPONDENTS: Progress United PAC

MUR 7107

and Joseph Aiken, as treasurer

5 6

I. INTRODUCTION

7 8

13

14

This matter was generated by a complaint alleging violations of the Federal Election

- 9 Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act") and Commission regulations by Progress United
- 10 PAC and Joseph Aiken in his official capacity as treasurer (the "PAC"). It was scored as a low-
- 11 rated matter under the Enforcement Priority System, by which the Commission uses formal
- scoring criteria as a basis to allocate its resources and decide which matters to pursue.

II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Factual Background

- The Complaint alleges that the PAC failed to file 48-hour notices of independent
- 16 expenditures related to web and radio ads, which ran the week of May 9, 2016.² Compl. at 2.
- 17 Also, the Complaint alleges that the PAC did not include a proper disclaimer on these
- 18 communications. Id. at 2, 3. The Complaint attached a screenshot from the webpage, which
- 19 features a picture of a state assemblyman with the caption "A Bailout for Atlantic City
- 20 Politicians." Compl. Attach. 1. The assemblyman is not a candidate for federal office.

The PAC is an independent-expenditure-only political committee that registered with the Commission on May 2, 2016. A search of the Virginia Department of Elections and the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission databases found no results for any entities named "Progress United." http://cfreports.sbe.virginia.gov/, http://www.elec.state.nj.us/publicinformation/searchdatabase.htm.

The Complaint includes an attachment of a web advertisement, but the Commission was not able to locate the alleged radio advertisements, which allegedly supported Progress United's position.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Case Closure — MUR 7107 (Progress United PAC) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 2

The PAC argues that at the time of its Response, it had not disseminated any communications in connection with any election.³ Comp. Resp. at 1. The PAC states that it was not responsible for any of the activities referred to in the Complaint; instead, a separate social welfare organization called Progress United was responsible. The PAC states that Progress United was organized under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.⁴ Id. at 1-2. The PAC also states that the activities referred to in the Complaint were issue advertisements related solely to non-federal issues in New Jersey, and did not refer to any federal candidate or

B. Legal Analysis

any election. Id. at 2.

In relevant part, an independent expenditure is an expenditure advocating for the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for federal office. If an entity makes independent expenditures aggregating \$10,000 or more with respect to a given election at any time up to and including the 20th day before the date of an election, the entity must file a 48-Hour Report disclosing those expenditures. Whenever a political committee makes a disbursement for a communication through a mailing or general public political advertising, the Act and

This statement appears to be accurate. See Progress United PAC July Quarterly Report, filed July 6, 2016, Progress United PAC October Quarterly Report, filed October 3, 2016, and Progress United PAC Post-General Report, filed November 30, 2016. However, the PAC appears to have begun disseminating communications the day after filing its Response. See Progress United PAC 24-Hour Reports of Independent Expenditures, dated October 29, 2016, October 31, 2016 (2), November 2, 2016, November 3, 2016, reporting independent expenditures made in opposition of Arthur L. Halvorson, a candidate for U.S. House of Representatives in Pennsylvania's Ninth District.

The Response includes a copy of the Internal Revenue Service Form 8976 that Progress United filed on August 5, 2016, registering it as a social welfare organization. The Commission notes that although Progress United and the PAC are two different entities, Progress United's address registered with the I.R.S. is the same address as the PAC's treasurer, Joseph Aiken, as provided in the PAC's Statement of Organization.

^{5 52} U.S.C. § 30101(2), (17)(A).

⁵² U.S.C. § 30104(g)(2); 11 C.F.R. § 109.10(c). The entity must file additional reports within 48 hours after each time it makes or contracts to make independent expenditures aggregating an additional \$10,000. Id.

Case Closure — MUR 7107 (Progress United PAC) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 3

- 1 Commission regulations require that the communication shall clearly state that it has been paid
- 2 for by the committee. ⁷ See also 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(a)(1), (b)(1), (c)(1).
- 3 Since it does not appear that the PAC is responsible for the activity mentioned in the
- 4 Complaint, the Commission finds no reason to believe that the PAC violated the Act or
- 5 Commission regulations.

⁷ 52 U.S.C. § 30120(a)(1). See also 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(a)(1), (b)(1). Additionally, websites of political committees available to the general public must include a disclaimer clearly stating who paid for the communication. 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(a)(1).